

REMARKS

This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Office Action dated June 12, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following.

Summary of Rejections

Claims 1, 4, 6, 11-13, 16, 18-20 and 22-34 were pending at the time of the Office Action.

Claims 11-13, 16, 18-20, 22-23, 28 and 30-34 were rejected under USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1, 4, 6 and 24-30 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 24-27 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sachse et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,985,901 B1 (hereinafter "Sachse") further in view of Ron Everett, U.S. Application Publication 2004/0024790 A1 (hereinafter "Everett").

Summary of Response

Claims 1, 11, 19, 27, 28, and 33 are currently amended.

Claims 24, 26, 29, and 30 have been canceled herein.

Claims 4, 6, 12-13, 16, 18, 20, 22, 23, 25, 31, 32, and 34 were Previously Presented.

Claims 2-3, 5, 7-10, 14-15, 17, and 21 have been previously canceled.

Remarks and Arguments are provided below.

Summary of Claims Pending

Claims 1, 4, 6, 11-13, 16, 18-20, 22, 23, 25-28, and 31-34 are currently pending following this response.

Interview Request

Applicants previously submitted an Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form and an attachment detailing a desired interview agenda. Due to the availability of Examiner Ahluwalia and a Primary Examiner an interview was not scheduled. In a telephone call on September 6, 2007 Examiner Ahluwalia suggested that a response be filed including the content of the interview agenda. The following response follows Examiner Ahluwalia's suggestion.

Applicants respectfully submit that the following response fully addresses all of the pending rejections and places the application in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues upon review of this response, Examiner Ahluwalia is requested to contact the undersigned for an interview to address any remaining issues.

Response to Rejections

The pending application is related to loading realistic test data into a database in a test environment. Using a data loading tool, data is read from a system database and copied into a test database. The data loading tool comprises an initialization component, a control generator, an extractor component, and a loader component.

Paragraph 0031 discloses that the initialization component may obtain a tables list identifying tables or files of a source database. Paragraph 0032 discloses that the tables list may identify the relationship between the tables in the tables list, such as parent/child relationships of various tables. For example, the relationship may be identified by the order in which the tables are listed in the tables list.

Paragraphs 0029 and 0030 of the pending application disclose that the initialization component may obtain test data related information. For example, the initialization component may receive a request for test data. Paragraphs 0032, 0036, and 0037 disclose that the initialization component may read the first table from the tables list and search the first table (first table 50 shown in Fig. 3) by the primary key (first key 54 shown in Fig. 3) to locate the requested data (data1 56 shown in Fig. 3). The initialization component may identify other key fields, such as the secondary key of the first table (second key 58 shown in Fig. 3). Paragraphs 0032 and 0037 further disclose that the secondary key of the first table may be associated with the requested data to identify or locate additional data related to the requested data (data2 60 shown in Fig. 3).

Paragraphs 0033 and 0038 disclose that the initialization component may identify a second table in the tables list (second table 52 shown in Fig. 3), wherein based on the relational nature of the tables, the secondary key of the first table is the primary key of the second table. The initialization component may identify a third key (third key 62 shown in Fig. 3). Using the location of the additional data in the primary key of the second table, the initialization component may identify more data related to the requested data (data3 64 shown in Fig. 3).

Paragraphs 0033 and 0035 disclose that the initialization component may generate a load file that maintains a record of the table, key, and corresponding data, for each record of test data desirable for testing. The order of records in the load file may enable easy recreation of the data while maintaining the relational integrity of the source database.

Paragraphs 0039 and 0040 disclose that the control generator generates control files for extracting and/or loading data from the system database to the test database. Paragraphs 0041-0043 disclose the extractor component utilizes the load file to extract the requested and related data from the system database and the loader component loads the extracted data into the test database based on the generated control files.

United States Patent No. 6,985,901 to Sachse et al., herein Sachse, discloses monitoring network events, manipulating data related to the network events, and storing the manipulated data in a database (Sachse: column 10, lines 16-39; column 13, lines 30-67; column 18, lines 2-13; and column 33, lines 5-31). While Sachse does disclose that the manipulated data may be stored in a plurality of databases such as a database

for testing purposes (Sachse: column 33, lines 25-29), Sachse does not disclose an initialization component that identifies all of the relationally associated data corresponding with requested data, extracting data from a source database based on the load file, and loading a database with the extracted data such that the loaded data maintains the relational integrity of the source database corresponding to the claim limitations as detailed below.

Response to Rejections under Section 112

In the Office Action dated June 12, 2007, Claims 11-13, 16, 18-20, 22-23, 28 and 30-34 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The Office Action indicates that support for the amendments made to previous claims is not found in the specification, especially with regards to the third portions and the third table and fourth portion.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments with regards to the third portions were fully described throughout the specification as originally filed, including Figure 3 and paragraphs 0037 and 0038. In particular, Applicants note the data3 64.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments with regards to the third table and fourth portion were fully described throughout the specification as originally filed, including paragraphs 0032 and 0033. Applicants note that MPEP 2163(I)(B)

states, "While there is no *in haec verba* requirement, newly added claim limitations must be supported in the specification through express, implicit, or inherent disclosure." Further, "The fundamental factual inquiry is whether the specification conveys with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, applicant was in possession of the invention as now claimed. See, e.g., *Vas-Cath, Inc.*, 935 F.2d at 156364, 19 USPQ2d at 1117." Applicants respectfully submit that while the specification does not expressly disclose a third table with a fourth portion of data, it is reasonably clear to those skilled in the art that claimed process disclosed in paragraph 0032 to generate the load list may be performed on any number of tables relationally associated with tables identified by the requested data 30. As disclosed in paragraph 0033 as originally filed, "The initialization component 16 continues this process through the tables listed on the tables list 32 until all of the tables, key fields, and related data have been identified" (emphasis added).

With regard to claim 11 as amended, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification as originally filed meets the written description requirement through at least paragraphs 0029-0040 and Figure 3 as detailed in the Response to Rejections section above.

With regard to claims 12 and 13, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification as originally filed meets the written description requirement through at least paragraphs 0049-0053 and Figure 7.

With regard to claim 16, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification as originally filed meets the written description requirement through at least paragraph

0039.

With regard to claim 18, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification as originally filed meets the written description requirement through at least paragraph 0038.

With regard to claim 19, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification as originally filed meets the written description requirement through at least paragraphs 0029-0040 and Figure 3 as detailed in the Response to Rejections section above.

With regard to claim 20, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification as originally filed meets the written description requirement through at least paragraphs 0037 and 0038.

With regard to claim 22, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification as originally filed meets the written description requirement through at least paragraphs 0037 and 0038.

With regard to claim 23, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification as originally filed meets the written description requirement through at least paragraphs 0032, 0034, 0037, and 0038.

With regard to claim 28, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification as originally filed meets the written description requirement through at least paragraphs 0032 and 0033.

With regard to claim 30, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification as originally filed meets the written description requirement through at least paragraphs 0032, 0033, and 0035.

With regard to claim 31, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification as originally filed meets the written description requirement through at least paragraphs 0045.

With regard to claim 32, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification as originally filed meets the written description requirement through at least paragraphs 0032.

With regard to claim 33, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification as originally filed meets the written description requirement through at least paragraphs 0032, 0033, 0037, and 0038.

With regard to claim 34, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification as originally filed meets the written description requirement through at least paragraphs 0032 and 0033.

Response to Rejections under Section 101

In the Office Action dated June 12, 2007, Claims 1, 4, 6 and 24-30 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 has been amended herein to recite, "A data loading tool operable on a computer system for loading a target database." Support for this amendment may be found in at least paragraph 0026 of the specification as originally filed. Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment overcomes this rejection and respectfully requests the rejection of Claims 1, 4, 6 and 24-30 under 35 USC § 101 be withdrawn.

Response to Rejections under Section 103

In the Office Action dated June 12, 2007, Claims 1, 4, 6, 24-27 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sachse et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,985,901 B1 (hereinafter "Sachse") further in view of Ron Everett, U.S. Application Publication 2004/0024790 A1 (hereinafter "Everett").

Claim 1:

I. Sachse in view of Everett does not teach or suggest an initialization component that identifies requested data and data related to the requested data as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claim 1 do not introduce any new matter. Support for these amendments may be found in at least paragraphs 0029-0040 of the specification as originally filed as detailed in the Response to Rejections section above.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, "the initialization component further operable to ... search the first table by a primary key of the first table to locate the requested data, ... and identify a first data that is related to the requested data by associating the at least one secondary key of the first table with the location of the requested data." Claim 1 also recites, "the initialization component further operable to ... identify second data that is related to the requested data by associating the at least one secondary key of the second table with a location of the first data in the primary key of the second table". Claim 1 further recites, "the initialization component further operable to generate a load file that maintains a record of tables, keys, and data

identified by the initialization component in an order that maintains a relational integrity of the source database." Applicants note that Claim 1 requires that data is extracted from the source database based on the load file.

Applicants respectfully submit that Sachse does not provide any teaching or suggestion of identifying data related to requested data. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Sachse does not provide any teaching or suggestion of extracting requested data and data related to the requested data. A search of Sachse for the term "extract" resulted in the following sections of Sachse: Fig. 6, element 616; Column 13, lines 53-61; Column 15, line 6; Column 16, line 63; Column 33, lines 8-22 and 42-46; Column 34, lines 46-55; Column 67, line 13 – Column 69, line 43; Column 118, lines 49-57; Column 119, lines 13-21; Column 143, lines 35-41; Column 173, lines 47-48; and Column 183, lines 27-28.

The only substantive discussion of extracting data from a source database is found in Column 67, line 13 – Column 69, line 43 of Sachse. Applicants respectfully submit that Sachse does not teach or suggest identifying tables, keys, and data related to the requested data and extracting the identified data as required by Claim 1.

It appears that the disclosure of Everett was only relied on to teach the existence of primary keys and secondary (foreign) keys. Applicants respectfully submit that this general disclosure does not cure the deficiencies of Sachse discussed above.

II. Sachse in view of Everett does not teach or suggest requesting test data.

Applicants further note that Claim 1 has been amended to require that the initialization component is further operable to "receive requested test data". Therefore,

Claim 1 requires that requested test data and data related to the requested test data be extracted from a source database and loaded in a target database. While Sachse does disclose in column 33, lines 25-29 that data may be stored in a second database for testing purposes, Sachse does not provide any teaching or suggestion of receiving a request for test data. As disclosed in paragraph 0043 of pending application, by receiving requested test data and extracting the requested test data and data related to the requested test data, a significantly smaller amount of data than that maintained by the source database may be extracted. This provides for a more efficient use of system resources as compared with copying the entire source database.

III. Sachse in view of Everett does not teach or suggest the claimed load file.

Applicants respectfully submit that the closest disclosure in Sachse of the claimed load file may be found in column 34, lines 45-55. While Sachse does disclose the generation of a flat file that is in a format that can be loaded into a database, Applicants respectfully submit that the generation of the flat files disclosed in the above cited portion of Sachse are not disclosed to include a record of tables, keys, and data that has been identified as related to requested test data, wherein the records are maintained in an order that maintains the relational integrity of the source database.

IV. Sachse in view of Everett does not teach or suggest the claimed loader component wherein the data loaded into the target database maintains the relational integrity of data in the source database.

Sachse discloses loading data into a target database with a data loading script described in Column 50, line 35 – Column 62, line 30. Applicants respectfully submit

that Sachse does not teach or suggest that the data loaded "maintains the relational integrity of data in the source database," as required by Claim 1.

For at least the reasons established above in sections I-IV, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Sachse in view of Everett and respectfully request allowance of this claim.

Dependent Claims 24, 26, and 29 have been canceled herein.

Dependent Claims 4, 6, 25, and 27 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the reasons established in sections I-IV above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 4, 6, 24-27 and 29 are not taught or suggested by Sachse in view of Everett and respectfully request allowance of these claims.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above. If the Examiner has any questions or comments or otherwise feels it would be helpful in expediting the application, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (972) 731-2288.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any further fees associated with any of the foregoing papers submitted herewith, or to credit any overpayment thereof, to Deposit Account No. 21-0765, Sprint.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael W. Piper
Reg. No. 39,800

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

Date: September 10, 2007

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
5601 Granite Parkway, Suite 750
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 731-2288
(972) 731-2289 (facsimile)